



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

At any rate, they were unwilling to regard the settlement as final. When the double line of railway is completed across Siberia, and the Russian navy is enlarged to the extent now proposed, conditions will be quite changed; and this must be taken into account by Japan.

The situation in Korea is yet far from being settled. To maintain supremacy there the Japanese need a military force and continued expenditure of money. At the present time a division and a half is stationed in Korea and another division in Manchuria.

Under such circumstances Japan cannot afford to run the risk of a war that would deprive her of what has been gained at so great a sacrifice of life and treasure.

9. The entire area of Japan is only 148,832 square miles, and less than that of the State of California. Of this total 30,371 square miles are included in the island Yezo (or the Hokkaido), which is mostly wilderness. The arable area of Japan is estimated at 25,000 square miles. Her total wealth is estimated at \$10,510,000,000. The wealth of the United States is estimated at about \$120,000,000,000. The average income of the people of Japan is but \$30 per capita. The average income of the United States is \$150 per capita.

To conduct an aggressive war against a nation with nearly double the population, with eleven times the financial strength, possessing a more powerful navy, and at a distance of from four to five thousand miles from the base, is a project that has never yet been attempted, and which no sane person would even consider. No hostile force could be organized and equipped without giving ample time for preparation to meet it, and with modern equipments even a small body of soldiers could repel any invading force. The simple matter of the difficulty of a coal supply for a fleet of battleships and transports would render an invasion utterly impossible. None of the war vessels would be able to carry sufficient coal for a round voyage, and a single hostile battleship could prevent new supplies being sent. The Hawaiian Islands, as well as the Philippines, would furnish a base for a hostile force in the rear, and the whole American fleet, including torpedo boats and submarines, would have to be first destroyed or captured.

10. The Japanese policy is one of peace and not war. On the 30th of November, 1908, the Japanese ambassador at Washington signed a declaration of the views of his government, in which he says: "It is the wish of his government to encourage the free and pacific development of the commerce on the Pacific Ocean." A similar declaration was signed by Secretary Root in behalf of the United States government. There has been no reason for any change in the attitude of the two nations towards each other, and it is incomprehensible to those who know the conditions that good people should be deluded with the idea that it is now a matter of vital importance to greatly increase and reorganize the army and multiply the battleships in order to prevent an invasion.

Speaking on this subject, the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Komura, said: "The foreign policy of this empire should have for its objects the maintenance of peace and the development of the national resources. The friendship between Japan and the United States is of traditional standing, and it is absolutely essential to the common interests of both states, not only to maintain unimpaired those sentiments of amity, but to

extend and strengthen them by every possible means. "The rash utterances of individuals are not the expression of the representative men in Japan, and are unworthy of consideration."

The former American Ambassador at Tokyo, Hon. Luke Wright, said on his return to the United States: "The talk of war between this country and Japan isn't even respectable nonsense. Japan no more wants war with us than we want one with her, and the idea that there is an impending conflict is ridiculous." His successor makes the assertion that, "so far as our two countries are concerned, there is not now one serious question that remains unsettled."

To multiply battleships and soldiers in fear of an invasion from Japan is not simply absolute folly, but a wicked waste of treasure and lives that ought to be devoted to some more worthy object.

I have just been told by the head of one of the English banks in Yokohama that, according to the terms of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, the consent of England must first be obtained before Japan could engage in war with the United States, and for various and important reasons such consent is not to be thought of. Thus for other and very different reasons war becomes impossible.

President Taft's Cure for War.

BY PROF. C. M. MEAD.

It is lamentable that, while our President shows a disposition to be in some respects more regardful of legal and constitutional restrictions than his predecessor, in the matter of armaments he is urging a continuance of the Roosevelt policy. His speech at a banquet of the Peace and Arbitration League in New York on March 22 not only avowed that he should do his utmost to secure the building of two battleships annually, but announced his belief in the doctrine that the most effectual influence for preventing war is the pecuniary expense which it involves, and the consequent danger of a government's being bankrupted or upset. And accordingly he wants the increase of our navy to go on until the completion of the Panama Canal, "and then we can stop and think whether we wish to go further!"

Truly a cheerful prospect! Any war, we are told, is liable to be so expensive as to bankrupt a nation. Therefore let us go on building battleships in preparation for war, even though such preparation itself runs us into bankruptcy. It has run us into debt; it has turned a surplus into a deficit; we are urged to keep on for at least five years in the same way, piling up a huge debt for our navy and for the Panama Canal; and then we can stop and think! Would it not be well to stop and think now? To think what a woful waste this battleship building is; to think how utterly needless this preparation for war is; to think how our example serves to stimulate the military spirit not only at home but in other countries; to think that going armed to the teeth is no way to prevent quarrels; to think that, after a century of practically no army or navy, during which no foreign power has made war on us, this present increase of armaments can mean to other nations nothing else than a threat.

This banquet in New York, at ten dollars a plate,

seems to have been gotten up for the purpose of giving Mr. Taft an opportunity to boom his scheme for more battleships. That it was called a banquet of the Peace and Arbitration League indicates that nowadays movements for pushing warlike measures are most conveniently carried on by giving them the name of measures for promoting peace. This shows at least that the peace cause has made progress. Once the war spirit could laugh at peace societies. Now the war spirit puts on a peace masque, and solemnly assures us that the best mode of securing peace is to be so well armed that no enemy will dare attack us. The fact is overlooked that such a policy, if good for us, must be equally good for other nations, and that accordingly the only sure guaranty of universal peace is a condition of the world in which each nation is more strongly armed than every other! Yet, notwithstanding the absurdity thus involved, there are thousands of unthinking men, in Congress and out of it, who seem to have accepted the doctrine that the best way to maintain peace is to be constantly preparing for war. They are for going ahead in this way for five years at least before they "stop and think." Let us hope that, in Congress and out of it, there are enough who have already stopped and thought, and are ready to call a halt to the ruinous extravagance to which President Taft is urging us.

New Haven, Conn.

A Group of Letters on Arrest of Armaments, etc.

Letter of W. O. Hart, Esq., of New Orleans to Congressman M. J. Foster.

MARCH 14, 1910.

Hon. M. J. Foster, Washington, D. C.

My dear Friend: As a member of the American Peace Society and kindred organizations, I deem it my duty to protest and remonstrate against the further increase of our navy, and hope it may conform to your ideas to work and vote against same, and particularly against the building of two great battleships costing anywhere from eleven million to eighteen million dollars each.

The amount of money spent for these battleships, if devoted to reforestation, to the waterways of this country, to drain the swamp lands, to irrigation and to education, would benefit our people as a whole and millions of them individually, while the building of the battleships benefits nobody except the builders. They become useless in a few years, while the public works above referred to, and many others, will last forever.

"Peace on earth, goodwill to men" ought to be the motto of this country, not only for itself, but in setting an example to other nations, and it is a poor example to set to constantly prepare for war.

Letter from Judge A. N. Waterman of Chicago to Hon. M. B. Madden, Member of Congress from Illinois.

MARCH 11, 1910.

Hon. Martin B. Madden, Washington, D. C.:

My dear Mr. Madden: I hope you will give your vote and influence against the enormous appropriation asked by the Department of the Navy. No one knows better than you that taxation ultimately falls upon every indi-

vidual who is not supported by public charity. I do not think there is one of your constituents who will not have to pay some portion of whatever appropriation may be made for the maintenance and increase of the very great, the unnecessarily large, navy which for some years we have been maintaining.

There is but one nation in the world which needs a great navy, and that is Great Britain, because the inhabitants of the British Isles depend very largely for their supply of bread stuffs upon importations o'er sea from other countries. The influence of naval bureaus, naval officers, and indeed the entire naval service, is for war.

President Roosevelt, in reply to an application of officers of what may be termed the "fighting line," that hospital ships should be commanded by them and not by officers of the medical department, said, "No officer trained to handle ships and men in time of war, if worth his salt, would wish to be assigned to the command of a hospital ship." This is quite true, and President Roosevelt might with equal truth have said, No officer worth his salt, educated and trained for the handling of ships in time of war, would wish to go through his life without ever having been in battle; to wear his uniform, carry his sword and receive his pay for that which he earnestly hoped he would never be called upon to do. In the very nature of things, officers of the fighting line, if worthy of the uniform they wear, the rank they have and the respect they receive, desire that sometime in their existence they may have an opportunity to show they are more than gilded figures.

Human nature is such, I may say the nature of honorable men is such, that the leaders of armies earnestly desire an opportunity to prove that they are worthy of their calling. The maintenance of a great navy, as of a great army, always means a distrust of our neighbors' professions of peaceful intentions, and is often an indication upon our part of an intention not to be just to those toward whom we feel we can afford to be otherwise. Nations, as individuals, ought to feel they can trust their neighbors, and that they need not at all times have an armed force on guard to protect their homes from the assaults of those with whom they have the most friendly associations. The condition of continued preparedness for war, the expenditure by four of the greatest of nations of more than a billion dollars per annum in the maintenance of armies and navies ready at any moment to slaughter and destroy, is a disgrace to the civilization we have and the professions of honor, truthfulness and right dealing we make.

Letter from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, to Congressman Tawney of Minnesota.

My Dear Mr. Tawney: I write to thank you for your courageous and statesmanlike utterance printed in the *New York Sun* of this morning, in regard to what I can only describe as a preposterous proposal to have the United States government build the largest and most powerful navy in the world. At a time when the minds of reasonable and instructed men the world over are turning more and more toward the judicial settlement of international differences and the cultivation of international goodwill through steadily increasing commercial,